

## REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on September 15, 2008.

Claims 1, 8, 12, 17 and 18 are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1, 3-8 and 11-18 are now pending in this application.

### Claim Objections

Claim 18 was objected to for informality, namely, improper dependency. Claim 18 has been amended to depend from claim 17 as requested by the Office Action. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

### §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 3, 5-8 and 11-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott et al. (US 6,925,547: hereinafter “Scott”) and in view of Fossum et al. (US 4,888,679: hereinafter “Fossum”).

Claims 1, 8, 12 and 17 have been amended to more clearly define Applicant’s claimed invention. Amended claims 1, 8, 12 and 17 similarly recite “the RTT translates memory addresses received from other processing nodes such that the memory addresses are translated into physical addresses within the shared memory” and “**each TLB [existing separately from the RTT in a given processing node] translates memory references from its associated processor to the shared memory on its processing node.**”

In the phone conversation dated on November 25, 2009, the Examiner seemed to equate Scott’s **(internal) TLB** dedicated to a local processor in a given (e.g., source) node and **(external) TLB** located in a SHUB in the given node to Applicant’s TLB and RTT in a given processing node, respectively. For the equation to prevail, the (internal) TLB in Scott must be shown to translate memory references from the local processor to the given node’s shared local memory while the (external) TLB in the SHUB translates memory references from other (e.g., remote) nodes to the shared local memory.

Scott, however, explicitly discloses that “**the address translation mechanism used by CE 64 uses an (external) TLB located on the local SHUB, or an external TLB located on a**

**remote SHUB, but does not use the [internal] TLBs which are used by the processors themselves to perform translations.”** See Scott, col. 14, lines 47-51. Scott further goes on to state that “**the address translation mechanism [used by CE 64] may be used to perform both local and remote address translations**, with the (external) TLB on the local SHUB used for translating a virtual address if a CD indicates that the local node is the connection endpoint [(i.e., for local memory address reference)], and the (external) TLB on a remote SHUB used for translating the virtual address if a CD indicates that the remote node is the endpoint [(i.e., for remote memory address reference)].” See *id.* at col. 18, line 65 through col. 19, line 4. As such, Scott’s (internal) TLB is not equivalent to Applicant’s TLB. Applicant was unable to find such teachings as required by claims 1, 8, 12 and 17 anywhere within the bounds of Scott.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Scott nor Fossum, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a computer system and method as taught by Applicant and claimed in amended claims 1, 8, 12 and 17. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 8, 12 and 17 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-7, 11, 13-16 and 18 are allowable as being dependent on one of corresponding independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 17 which are believed to be allowable.

### CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative at (612) 373-6909 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(612) 373-6909

Date December 15, 2008

By Thomas F. Brennan  
Thomas F. Brennan  
Reg. No. 35,075

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on December 15, 2008.

CANDIS BUENDING

Name

Signature

